



Northern Planning Committee Updates

Date: Wednesday, 10th August, 2022
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

The information on the following pages was received following publication of the committee agenda.

7. 21/6431M - Change of use from offices to C2 accommodation to create 8no. 1 bedroom flats with associated amenities: Catherine House, Catherine Street, Macclesfield, SK11 6BB for Martin Ball, North West Capital (Pages 3 - 6)

8. 22/0566M - Residential redevelopment of former Winstanley House site and demolition of associated garages. Replacement building containing 28 no 100% affordable apartments, car parking and landscaping: Winstanley House, Northwich Road, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 0AF for Mr Dan Brocklehurst, Peaks and Plains Housing Trust (Pages 7 - 10)

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10 August 2022

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

21/6431M

LOCATION

Catherine House, Catherine Street, Macclesfield.

UPDATE PREPARED

08th August 2022

CONSULTATIONS

Senior Commissioning Manager – Learning Disabilities & Mental Health, Adult Social Care & Health - expands on the description of “complex needs”
‘In terms of commissioner support we have been working with the care provider Alternative Futures and the housing provider Halo Housing to ensure that the service and accommodation meets the needs and demands of people with complex needs. For this particular development this would be people with learning disabilities and/or Autism. This accommodation would meet the needs of individuals with a range of support needs ranging from some who may be independent but require some 1-1 support to others who may be a bit more complex in terms of the support required and therefore require additional levels of support. People living in the accommodation would be supported by staff on site at all times, during the day and at night’.

Clr Braithwaite - Raises the following concerns

- Potential disturbance from staff shift changes, residents/visitors/support workers coming and going etc. within feet of existing residential properties. Conditions were placed on the Picturedrome so same should apply.
- Potential for disturbance from residents/staff gathering outside in the extremely limited space available, close to existing properties.
- Concern about the specific complex needs, what are they and how may this affect the residential amenity. Although the report says low-level support for adults with learning disabilities, the letter of support from the Adults Commissioning Team refers to learning difficulties and other complex needs.
- The dimensions shown on the revised plans for the proposed ground floor are incorrect, they all say 42 sq m when some are not.
- There are a couple of applications missing from the Relevant History, which are relevant in terms of historical use. They are 82902P and 02/0574P and have conditions relating to hours of use.

- It appears that the only positive regard to amenity in the report is that given to the proposed development and is disregarded for existing residents despite conditions in previous applications to protect them.
- It should be noted that the public open space presumably Christ Church grounds, has recently been designated as being within a PSPO boundary
- There is no evidence that site has been marketed for any length of time. There are three businesses registered as active at the property (Companies House website) and mail is collected regularly (as observed by neighbour).
- HOU 2 is referred to but not how the specific criteria is met – not knowing the type of resident makes it impossible to take a balanced view.
- There is also no regard given to housing mix, there is already supported living round the corner.
- Some of the bathrooms have no windows, what are the extract arrangements? Is it acceptable in terms of health (risk of mould etc)
- Are bins domestic or industrial? Collection arrangements in either case?
- The report states that there will be 2 members of staff on site at all times, however no staff amenity area other than the office. E.g., toilets, kitchen area etc.

REPRESENTATIONS

2 Additional objections have been received and are summarised below;

- People living within supported living accommodation are protected by DOLS (Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards) Catherine House is not a suitable accommodation, where there are not suitable gardens.
- Some of the proposed windows opaque which will not allow residents to look outside their surroundings,
- This a speculative, poorly thought out building.
- Catherine House, is suitable only for its current use (an office building)
- Canalside View, consists of and provides 7 shared apartments for 16 Tenants and was purpose built with unrestricted views from the majority of the apartments looking out onto Macclesfield Canal.
- The committee report is a selective reading of the Design Guide. It actually states that “the minimum residential amenity standards for property fronts to fronts (18 metres) and back to backs (21 metres), A more precise measurement should be made to numbers 13, 15 and 24 George Street West and reconsidered in light of the letter of DC38 and the spirit of the design guidance.
- With no outdoor space and some upstairs rooms with limited windows or opaque glass, it would be naïve to believe that the external landing and stairs will not be used by residents for smoking (as this is likely to be banned indoors) and fresh air.
- Lack of on site amenity space contradicts the fact and/or spirit of local plans which underline the importance of private outdoor amenity space.

- There is no indication of how long the user would commit to housing their vulnerable clients in assisted living accommodation without outside space.
- It seems likely that this will be seen as poor accommodation by quality providers with high aspirations for their residents.

Macclesfield Civic Association

Within the committee report the following comments from Macclesfield Civic Society have been reported as a representation of support. However, for clarification this is a representation of COMMENT only.

The comments are repeated below for reference.

'The surrounding area is largely residential in character and the proposal would be consistent with such. Minor changes to the external appearance of the building will allow for the provision of 8 small units of accommodation close to the facilities of the town centre. Existing parking provision would be available though perhaps some reduction could be secured to allow for the provision of some external amenity space'.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Amenity

Separation distances

The amenity section of the report deals with the impact on residents with particular regard to privacy and privacy distances. Properties to the south east of the site along Pierce Street are below the 21m separation distance outlined with the Cheshire East Design Guide (vol 2) at approx. 13-14m from the first floor window on the rear elevation that is proposed to serve a bedroom. However, the rear elevation and the first floor windows of the building are at oblique angles to the existing properties along Pierce Street. Para 111 of the CE Design Guide (vol 2) states 'rear distances between properties where habitable rooms face one another should not drop below 21 metres to ensure privacy and good levels of light internally and some degree of privacy to rear gardens. Where the rear of properties sit at oblique angles to one another...then these distances can potentially be reduced.'

Lack of outdoor amenity space

This is the change of use of an existing building within a town centre location. It is not uncommon for residential accommodation within town centres to have no private amenity space. The report outlines the distances to local open spaces.

A resident has raised concern about the use of the external stair case as an amenity space, however whilst this is to be repositioned along the rear elevation, this is an existing emergency access only.

Obscure Glazing

There are to be 2 windows at first floor that would serve habitable rooms and that are obscure glazed. However, these are secondary windows and not the main window for the room and in this instance are considered appropriate.

Noise and Disturbance

This site is located within the town centre where a certain level of noise and disturbance can be expected. The additional noise from 2 members of staff changing shift and visitors to the building is not considered to result in an increase in noise and general activity such that would be considered unreasonable in this location.

Other Matters

Complex Needs

The commissioning manager has confirmed that the accommodation will provide assisted living accommodation for residents with learning disabilities and/or autism. The applicant has confirmed that the individuals suited for this support model are those who do not have highly complex needs and who are more suited to living independently with background support and some 1:1 hours. The proposals are considered to meet a specific need and therefore comply with policy HOU 2 in this regard.

Housing Mix

With regard to housing mix, the site provides for individual one bed units for supported living and so would not warrant the provision of a mix of unit sizes on site.

Cllr Braithwaite has queried the ventilation for bathrooms without windows. Bathrooms can be mechanically ventilated and a matter for Building regulations.

It has also been raised that there is no evidence of the property being marketed. No evidence has been submitted to support the statement that the applicant has made in regard to marketing of the site for alternative occupiers. It is acknowledged within the report that the proposals do not fully comply with CELPS policy EG3.

All floor areas have been checked and are correct as labelled on the plans (all being a minimum 42sqm). This does not include communal hallways.

The application form states there is no trade waste from the site and there is to be a refuse store on site.

RECOMMENDATION

As in the original report a recommendation of approval is made.

Northern Planning Committee 10th August 2022

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION No.

22/0566M – Residential redevelopment of former Winstanley House site and demolition of associated garages. Replacement building containing 28 no 100% affordable apartments, car parking and landscaping.

LOCATION

Winstanley House, Northwich Road, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 0AF

UPDATE PREPARED

5th August 2022

REPRESENTATIONS

Within the committee report, the 2 letters of support were not expanded upon. The supportive correspondence highlighted the following positive aspects of the scheme:

Heritage & Design

- The proposals meet the design requirements of Policy D1 of the Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan, having taken account of the Knutsford Design Guide
- Architectural design of the scheme fits well with the two character areas that border the site
- Proposals also meet the requirements of Policy D2 of the Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan in terms of local distinctiveness.
- Scale, height and massing as well as material choices have been respected
- Proposals meet the Neighbourhood Plan policies in relation to ‘previously developed land’, Policy H2
- Housing mix is supported as there is a need for the size of units proposed

Ecology

- Satisfied with the submitted ecological details of the scheme and the ability of the site to contribute to the local wildlife habitats

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Landscape

Policy SE4 of the CELPS refers to Landscape. The crux of the policy is to conserve the landscape character and quality and where possible, enhance and effectively manage the historic, natural and man-made landscape features that contribute to local

distinctiveness of both rural and urban landscapes. Emerging Policy ENV5 of the SADPD is also a consideration.

The Council's Landscape Officer has reviewed the proposals and advised that no objections are raised subject to the submitted boundary treatment plan being updated to show a continuation of the existing wall along the western boundary of the site. In addition, a new hedgerow should be proposed along the eastern boundary to provide a greater degree of security and privacy for the future occupiers. A detailed planting plan should also be provided.

As such, subject to conditions to address these matters, the application is deemed to adhere with the relevant aspects of Policy SE4 of the CELPS.

Other matters

The Council's Heritage and Urban Design Officer's also recommend that the western boundary treatment be updated from being a fence, to a continuation of the existing wall.

Conclusions

The application proposes the erection of an affordable housing apartment block in a predominantly residential area of Knutsford. Within such locations, development is deemed to be acceptable in principle, subject to its adherence with all relevant policies of the development plan.

Of particular relevance in this instance are policies relating to affordable housing, heritage and design, neighbouring amenity, highway safety and trees.

The Council's Affordable Housing Officer is satisfied that the tenure mix and size of the units being provided (in terms of the number of beds) satisfy a local need and as such, is supportive of the scheme. This provision is to be secured via S106 Agreement.

The site lies adjacent to two Conservation Areas and as such, the impact upon the setting of these is a consideration. Following pre-application discussions and revisions received during the application process, both the Council's Heritage and Urban Design Officers are now satisfied with the latest set of plans, subject to conditions.

Following the receipt of an updated Noise Impact Assessment in order to consider the impact of any possible noise pollution from the substation, the Council's Environmental Protection Officer raises no environmental amenity concerns subject to conditions. No issues are raised in relation to neighbouring loss of privacy, light or visual intrusion, subject to an obscure glazing condition.

Although the proposals provide a below-standard number of parking spaces, the Council's Highway's Officer is satisfied with the level of provision proposed given that the units are 1 and 2 bed only. The site is also sustainably located. No concerns are raised in relation to access, traffic impact and highway safety.

TPO trees lie adjacent to the site but will not be impacted by the development. Three (3) C-category trees are sought for removal to accommodate the proposed development. The Council's Tree Officer raises no objections to the removal of these trees or the scheme overall, subject to conditions.

No issues are deemed to be created with regards to flood risk and drainage, the impact of the proposals upon Manchester Airport and the impact of the proposals upon local health provision subject to conditions and a commuted sum.

Matters in relation to Landscape are deemed acceptable, subject to the conditioning of updated boundary treatment details and landscaping details.

For the above reasons, the application is recommended for approval subject to a S106 Agreement and conditions

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to a S106 Agreement to secure the following:

S106	Amount	Trigger
Affordable Housing	100% on-site provision	N/a
Health – Commuted Sum	£18,864	Prior to occupation

And the following conditions:

- 1. Time (3 years)**
- 2. Plans**
- 3. Submission/approval of facing and roofing materials**
- 4. Submission/approval of window and door details**
- 5. Implementation of supporting tree documents/plans**
- 6. Submission/approval of an engineer designed no-dig hard surface construction for hard surfacing within RPA's**
- 7. Submission/approval of updated Landscaping Plan**
- 8. Landscape – implementation**
- 9. Submission/approval of updated boundary treatment plan to include wall along western boundary (*in consultation with residents beyond western boundary*)**
- 10. Submission/approval of levels**
- 11. Obscure glazing – Far southern elevation, first-floor corridor and unit 19**
- 12. Implementation of Noise Mitigation**
- 13. Submission/approval of electric vehicle charging infrastructure**
- 14. Submission/approval of a Travel Plan**
- 15. Submission/approval of a Phase I contaminated land report**
- 16. Submission/approval of a contaminated land verification report**
- 17. Submission/approval of an imported soil verification report**
- 18. Works should stop should contamination be identified**

- 19.Nesting birds**
- 20.Implementation of ecological enhancement plan**
- 21.Submission/approval of a detailed surface & foul water drainage strategy (*drainage and trees*)**
- 22.Submission/approval of a drainage management and maintenance plan**
- 23.Submission/approval of a dust and smoke management plan (*construction and demolition*)**
- 24.No open pools or ponds should be created**
- 25.All exterior lighting shall be capped at the horizon**
- 26.No solar panels without approval**

In order to give proper effect to the Committee's intent and without changing the substance of its decision, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning (Regulation) in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) to correct any technical slip or omission in the resolution, before issue of the decision notice